Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-3, 6-12 and 15-31 are presently pending, with all pending claims standing rejected. Claims 1, 10, and 19-25, representing all pending independent claims, are herein amended. Support for the claim amendments is found throughout the specification as originally filed. For example, see page 18, lines 4-21; page 19, lines 12-23; and page 26, lines 10-16. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

On June 30, 2006, applicant's attorney, Stephen J. Weed, conducted an Examiner Interview with Examiner Asghar Bilgrami to review various claim rejections and the Office Action mailed March 20, 2006. Although a consensus on allowable subject matter was not achieved, Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the interview.

All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly (U.S. Patent No. 6,427,164 B1) and Nielsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,405,243 B1). Applicant herein amends claims 1, 10, and 19-25, representing all pending independent claims of the application, to further distinguish those claims over the Reilly and Nielsen references. Claim 1, as amended, is directed to an e-mail address change notification deputization system that provides address change notification to a sender of an e-mail to a client (i.e., the e-mail recipient) and recites the following features:

> a first provider server in which a first e-mail address of a client is set;
>
> a second provider server in which a second e-mail address of said client is set; and

an address change notification deputization service server,

wherein said first provider server transfers an e-mail that is sent to said first mail address to said second provider server upon receiving this e-mail,

wherein said second provider server transfers an e-mail that has been transferred from said first provider server to said address change notification deputization service server upon receiving this e-mail,

wherein said address change notification deputization service server checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from said second provider server and makes a notification to the sender of the e-mail to the effect that the e-mail address of said client is said second mail address only in the case that this e-mail is received by said second provider server after transferred by said first provider server,

wherein said address change notification deputization service server makes a notification, to said client, of path information indicating whether said e-mail is sent via said first provider server or directly to said second provider server, and

wherein said path information includes statistical results indicating whether a plurality of said e-mails were sent via said first provider server or directly to said second provider server.

This means that a first e-mail address for a client (i.e., the e-mail recipient) is set in a first provider server and a second e-mail address for the client is set in a second provider server. E-mails sent to the first e-mail address are transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server. In addition, e-mails transferred from the first provider server to the second provider server are transferred to an address change notification deputization service server by the second provider server. The address change notification deputization service server checks the path of the e-mail transferred by the second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail of the second e-mail address set in the second provider

server if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by the first provider server.

In addition, the address change notification deputization service server checks the path of e-mails transferred by a second provider server and notifies a client (i.e., the e-mail recipient) of path information indicating whether an e-mail is sent via the first provider server or directly to the second provider server. The path information includes statistical results indicating whether a plurality of e-mails were sent via the first provider server or directly to the second provider server.

Reilly and Nielsen, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest at least three features of claim 1. These features include (1) an e-mail address of a client (i.e., recipient) set in a first provider server and set in a second provider server, (2) an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server, and (3) an address change notification deputization service server that makes a notification to a client of path information that includes statistical results indicating whether a plurality of e-mails were sent via a first provider server or directly to a second provider server. These distinctions are set forth in detail below.

E-mail Addresses Set in First and Second Provider Servers

Reilly and Nielsen neither alone nor in combination disclose, teach or suggest a first provider server in which a first e-mail address of a client is set and a second provider server in which a second e-mail address of the client is set. In claim 1, the intended recipient of an e-mail, i.e., the client, has a first e-mail

address that is set in a first provider server and a second e-mail address that is set in a second provider server. Thus, the first provider server and the second provider server both have a known address for the client. Reilly and Nielsen, however, deal with the situation where the e-mail address of the client known to a sender is no longer set in a provider server. See Reilly at column 2, lines 63-66 and Nielsen at column 5, line 67 to column 6, line 3. Thus, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose teach or suggest a first provider server in which a first e-mail address is set and a second provider server in which a second e-mail address is set.

Address Change Notification Deputization Service Server That Checks Path

Reilly and Nielsen neither alone nor in combination disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

In the Office Action, Nielsen is relied upon to teach checking the path of an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server. Nielsen, however, does not teach this feature. In Nielsen, when a sender wants to reach a recipient whose e-mail address has changed, the sender sends an e-mail message directly to an address change server. The address change server then sends the new e-mail address back to the sender. Nielsen, however, is devoid of checking the path of an e-mail that has been transferred from a first provider server to a second provider server. The address change server in Nielsen simply stores updated e-mail address information in a database and sends reply e-mails to the sender with the recipient's updated e-mail address. Therefore, the address

change server in Nielsen never checks the path of the e-mail that has been transferred from a second provider server and never checks whether this e-mail is received by the second provider server after transfer by a first provider server. In addition, the address change notification deputization service server of the present invention does not have a database such as the one in the address change server of Nielsen because the address change notification deputization service server of the present invention does not need to check a database for the new address itself because this information is obtained from the path of the transferred e-mail. Additionally, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Reilly does not disclose such features.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, Reilly and Nielsen fail to disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that checks the path of an e-mail that is received by a second provider server and notifies the sender of the e-mail if the e-mail is received by the second provider server after being transferred by a first provider server.

Notification to Client (i.e., Recipient)

Reilly and Nielsen neither alone nor in combination disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that makes a notification to a client of path information that includes statistical results indicating whether a plurality of e-mails were sent via a first provider server or a second provider server. In fact, Reilly and Nielsen are completely devoid of such a feature. Through the use of this feature, "the client [] may stop the e-mail address change notification service or may cancel the contract with the old provider." See the specification as originally filed at page 29, lines 6-12. Reilly and Nielsen fail to

disclose such functionality. Accordingly, Reilly and Nielson, neither alone nor in combination, disclose, teach or suggest an address change notification deputization service server that makes a notification to a client of statistical results.

For at least the three reasons set forth above, Reilly and Nielsen neither alone nor in combination disclose, teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 1. Therefore, applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art and respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Remaining Independent Claims

Independent claims 10 and 19-25, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, applicant contends that these claims are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above that claim 1 is allowable and respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11, 12, 15-18, and 26-31 include all the features of the independent claim from which they depend. Thus, claims 2, 3, 6-9, 11, 12, 15-18, and 26-31 are also allowable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above that their respective independent claims are allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth above, applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3, 6-12, and 15-31 are in condition for allowance and early notification of that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel N. Calder

Daniel N. Calder, Reg. 27,424
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicant

SJW/fp

Dated: July 17, 2006

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

July 17, 2006 Fran Petrillo

Fran Petrillo

FP_39210